



*One Court of Justice*  
**Michigan  
Supreme Court**

FY 2006 Budget Request

---





MICHIGAN SUPREME COURT

CLIFFORD W. TAYLOR  
CHIEF JUSTICE

March 24, 2005

925 WEST OTTAWA  
LANSING, MICHIGAN 48915  
PHONE: (517) 373-8635

The Honorable Glenn Steil, Jr., Chairman  
N-1091 House Office Building  
Lansing, MI 48933

The Honorable George Cushingberry, Jr.  
S-687 House Office Building  
Lansing, MI 48933

The Honorable John Stewart  
N-699 House Office Building  
Lansing, MI 48933

Dear Chairman Steil and Members of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the Judiciary:

The Michigan Supreme Court is pleased to submit its budget request for Fiscal Year 2006.

You will recall that, in 2004, the Governor and the Department of Management and Budget called for all state departments and agencies to find areas where restricted revenues can be used to offset general fund. In response, the Supreme Court proposed a two-part fee package that would allow the judiciary to replace some general fund dollars with restricted revenues. Key features of the package included increases in some civil filing fees, higher assessments and costs in criminal cases, and a simplified system for collecting and allocating those monies. As you know, the proposed fee package was supported by the Governor and passed, with some modifications, by the Legislature. I am pleased to report that a total of \$16 million in general fund will be replaced by restricted revenues in the judicial branch budget for FY 2004 – FY 2006. We believe other state agencies, including the Michigan State Police and Department of Corrections, will receive almost that much in increased revenues over the same period. Our proposed budget reflects these projected revenues.

Improving court collections continues to be a high priority for the judicial branch, not only to provide revenue for local funding units and state agencies, but also to ensure compliance with and respect for court orders. Our budget request details the many steps the courts have taken to improve collections, including a recent and very successful pilot project.


As in years past, some restricted revenue goes to the Judicial Technology Improvement Fund, which supports technological improvements to the judicial branch. One such initiative, the Judicial Network Project, is substantially complete. As a result, Michigan trial courts now report 97 percent of adult felony dispositions and 90 percent of juvenile felony dispositions electronically to the State Police. Additional projects being funded by the JTIF include a statewide warehouse of court information, electronic payment of traffic tickets, and electronic

filing of court documents.

Funding for the state's drug treatment court programs would be continued at the same level as in FY 2005: a total of \$4.6 million, including \$1.8 million of federal Byrne Memorial Formula Grant funds and \$1.7 million from the Justice System Fund. Michigan currently has 64 drug treatment courts, of which 8 are in the planning stages.

We appreciate the opportunity to address your committee. Deputy State Court Administrator Dawn Monk (517-373-4841), Budget Officer Karen Ellis (517-373-5544), and Supreme Court Counsel Michael Gadola (517-373-1294) are available if you would like further information or have any questions.

Sincerely,

  
Clifford W. Taylor  
Chief Justice

CWT/tjr

## **FY 2006 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court**

### **Table of Contents**

<b>Judiciary Fee Package Update.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Judicial Technology Improvement Fund (JTIF) .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Collections at Michigan Trial Courts.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Drug Treatment Courts.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Justices' and Judges' Salaries.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Economic Adjustments .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Michigan Supreme Court Fiscal Year 2006 Budget Request .....</b>	<b>12</b>

## FY 2006 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court

### Introduction

The Michigan Supreme Court recognizes that the State of Michigan faces continuing economic challenges in FY 2006. We will continue to work with the Legislature and the Executive Branch to find ways to reduce costs and increase efficiency while at the same time fulfilling our primary obligation: to serve the public and pursue the ends of justice.

During the FY 2004 budget cycle, the Judiciary worked with the Legislature and the Executive Branch to pass legislation to revise the system of assessments and costs in criminal cases and to increase civil filing fees. Including the proposed changes incorporated in the Governor's recommended budget, \$16.0 million of general fund has been replaced with restricted revenues in the Judiciary's budget in the three years since the implementation of this fee package. In addition, for FY 2006 the fee package is projected to provide additional revenues beyond original projected FY 2004 amounts of \$11.2 million for the Michigan State Police and nearly \$1.0 million for the Department of Corrections.

The proposed FY 2006 budget for the Judiciary increases total general fund by \$1.9 million from the enacted FY 2005 appropriation and provides a \$2.6 million general fund increase for judicial operations. This funding will be used to cover higher costs for items like health care and state retirement charges and inflation in other costs. Judiciary employees did not receive the 3% cost of living adjustment received by most Executive Branch employees for FY 2004 but did receive the 4% adjustment for FY 2005. The number of active employees on the Judiciary's payroll has decreased from 529 at the beginning of FY 2001 to 463 for the March 10, 2005, pay date. This is a decrease of 66 employees, about 12.5%, which has been achieved through attrition, layoffs, and not replacing early retirees. We continue to evaluate the budget situation and hope to be able to replace a limited number of these positions.

## FY 2006 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court

### Judiciary Fee Package Update

As part of the FY 2004 budget development process, the Judiciary presented two proposals to the Department of Management and Budget (DMB) to address the requirement that the Judiciary reduce its FY 2004 general fund budget by \$13.7 million from the then current FY 2003 level. These proposals were incorporated into the Governor's FY 2004 Budget Recommendation, and the Legislature approved the recommended budget with only minor modifications and passed other legislation (19 bills) necessary to enact the changes proposed by the Judiciary.

One part of the fee package was the Justice System Assessment and Minimum State Costs. This consolidated a variety of different costs and assessments that were then being charged by the trial courts under various statutes (e.g., court equity fund, highway safety fund, state court fund, secondary road patrol, jail reimbursement program) into a single amount charged to specified groups of violations (e.g., civil infractions, misdemeanors, felonies). The amounts collected are then pooled (in the Justice System Fund) and allocated in accordance with a statutory formula at the state level. The new system has simplified the assessment, collection, and distribution of monetary obligations imposed in criminal cases at the local trial courts.

The second part of the fee package was an increase in civil filing fees. Civil filing fees at the trial courts had last been increased from \$50 to \$100 in a multi-step process from 1993 to 1997. Effective October 1, 2003, these fees were increased 50% to \$150. Lesser increases were enacted for small claims and general civil and summary disposition below \$10,000. The filing fee legislation also simplified the process for reporting collections by the local courts. Instead of requiring the local courts to remit amounts collected based on recipients of the funds, filing fee revenue is pooled (in the Civil Filing Fee Fund) and allocated in accordance with a statutory formula at the state level.

In the Judiciary budget, these proposals provided state restricted revenues to replace \$11.2 million of general fund in FY 2004 and another \$2.5 million in FY 2005. Revenue projections indicate an additional \$2.3 million of general fund can be replaced in FY 2006, which has been incorporated in the Governor's recommended budget. This results in the replacement of a total of \$16.0 million of general fund with restricted revenues in the Judiciary's budget for the three years.

Additional funding over original projected FY 2004 amounts has also been provided for other state agencies, including projected increases by FY 2006 of \$11.8 million for the Michigan State Police and \$1.0 million for the Department of Corrections.

For FY 2004, both funds came in very close to the amounts we had originally projected – with the Justice System Fund coming in 1.4% (\$982,747) above the projected amount and the Civil Filing Fee Fund coming in 0.7% (\$267,289) less than the projected amount. See the table on the following page for a summary of projected FY 2005 and FY 2006 revenues for the two funds.

# FY 2006 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court

## **Projected Revenues for Justice System and Civil Filing Fee Funds**

	Original Projected Revenues for FY 2004 Prior to Changes	Fund Source	Actual FY 2004	Projected FY 2005	Projected FY 2006	Projected FY 2006 Revenue Over Original FY 2004
Amounts in Thousands (rounding differences)						
Judiciary						
Drug Treatment Courts	0.0	JSF	1,308.3	1,696.0	1,828.1	1,828.1
State Court Fund	7,600.0	JSF	7,961.0	7,914.6	8,531.3	931.3
State Court Fund	17,725.0	CFFF	18,036.0	18,165.7	18,165.7	440.7
Court Equity Fund	8,075.0	JSF	14,224.0	15,174.5	16,357.0	8,282.0
Court Equity Fund	0.0	CFFF	3,049.4	3,071.3	3,071.3	3,071.3
Community Dispute Resolution Program	1,210.0	CFFF	1,933.8	1,947.6	1,947.6	737.6
Judicial Technology Improvement Fund	0.0	CFFF	4,127.8	4,157.5	4,157.5	4,157.5
State Court Administrative Office	0.0	JSF	556.7	595.1	641.5	641.5
Total Judiciary	34,610.0		51,197.0	52,722.3	54,700.0	20,090.0
State Police						
Highway Safety Fund	7,000.0	JSF	13,750.8	14,758.0	15,908.0	8,908.0
Michigan Justice Training Fund	7,000.0	JSF	7,237.3	7,379.0	7,954.0	954.0
Secondary Road Patrol	14,000.0	JSF	13,574.0	14,000.0	14,000.0	0.0
State Forensic Lab/DNA Fees	1,700.0	JSF	2,171.2	3,332.4	3,592.1	1,892.1
Total State Police	29,700.0		36,733.3	39,469.4	41,454.1	11,754.1
Corrections – Jail Reimbursement Program	7,000.0	JSF	7,237.3	7,379.0	7,954.0	954.0
Legislative Retirement System						
Legislative Retirement System	570.0	JSF	668.0	684.3	737.7	167.7
Legislative Retirement System	525.0	CFFF	557.8	561.8	561.8	36.8
Total Legislative Retirement System	1,095.0		1,225.8	1,246.1	1,299.5	204.5
Judges' Retirement System						
Judges' Retirement/Court Fee Fund	855.0	JSF	0.0	0.0	0.0	(855.0)
Judges' Retirement/Court Fee Fund	7,578.7	CFFF	8,925.0	8,989.2	8,989.2	1,410.5
Total Judges' Retirement System	8,433.7		8,925.0	8,989.2	8,989.2	555.5
Treasury	0	JSF	556.7	595.1	641.5	641.5
State General Fund	551.2	CFFF	557.8	561.8	561.8	10.6
Grand Totals	81,390.0		106,432.9	110,962.9	115,600.0	34,210.0

## FY 2006 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court

### **Judicial Technology Improvement Fund (JTIF)**

Technology plays a key role in the efficient and timely delivery of justice to Michigan citizens. The JTIF receives 11.10% of amounts deposited in the Civil Filing Fee Fund to provide funding for technology projects that will improve the operation of and services provided by the state's judicial system. Projects being funded include the judicial network project, the judicial data warehouse, E-Ticket Payment, and eFiling.

#### **Judicial Network Project**

Thanks to the Judicial Network Project, Michigan trial courts now electronically report 97 percent of adult and 90 percent of juvenile felony dispositions to the State Police Criminal History System. Electronic reporting helps to meet federal goals for timely, complete and accurate reporting of criminal history information. With the Judicial Network Project, courts can update law enforcement information on a daily and often immediate basis, instead of a week or more later, which helps ensure that the public is protected and that criminals receive fair and appropriate sentences.

The State Police have historically maintained a central electronic repository for criminal records and case dispositions. They developed an electronic interface for the submission of dispositions from trial courts. However, many state trial courts lacked the ability to submit that information electronically. Also, the state's trial courts use 41 different case management systems. As a result, many of the court systems couldn't 'talk' electronically to the State Police system. In addition, most courts' computers and local area networks were obsolete, and the state did not have a secure network to connect the courts to the State Police's criminal history system.

To address those issues, the Michigan Supreme Court initiated the Judicial Network Project in 2001. The State Court Administrative Office's (SCAO) Judicial Information Systems (JIS) Division led the project, assisted by the Michigan State Police, the Michigan Department of Information Technology, the Trial Court Services Division of SCAO, and county and municipal governments. Also involved were SBC, EDS, Dell, and over 40 other private contractors.

The project initially concentrated on 25 courts with the highest felony caseloads, along with two Upper Peninsula counties. The five-phase project ultimately equipped all 319 court sites in Michigan's 83 counties with the hardware, software and connectivity needed to electronically transmit disposition data to the criminal history system.

The annual budget for the four-year project averaged \$2.3 million. Funding came from a National Criminal History Improvement Program grant and the JTIF. Also supporting the project was a portion of the penalty money returned to the State of Michigan after the federally-mandated Child Support Enforcement System was successfully implemented under the leadership of then-Chief Justice Maura D. Corrigan.



## **FY 2006 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court**

### **Judicial Data Warehouse**

Another project being developed with JTIF funds is a data warehouse of court information. Currently, the Judiciary's 251 trial court locations are supported by 41 different case management systems distributed on 150 different hardware platforms. As a result, courts have difficulty sharing case information with each other and with other branches of government. This inability to communicate creates an information void about defendants in criminal cases and others involved in the Michigan justice system.

Starting in 2002, SCAO began using JTIF money to add a judicial data warehouse to the existing state data warehouse. The data warehouse will give state trial judges access to a statewide name index with associated detail data to identify pending and closed cases in other courts. SCAO will be able to generate statistical and trend information from the data warehouse.

In 2003, a prototype design was developed using data from Isabella and Saginaw counties. In 2004, the project was expanded to include the mid-Michigan counties of Bay, Clinton, Genesee, Gratiot, Midland and Shiawassee. In 2005, the data warehouse will include courts in an additional 13 counties.

### **E-Ticket Payment**

The 62A District Court in Wyoming is the pilot site for the e-ticket payment project and has been in operation since February 2004. By going to <https://e.courts.michigan.gov/>, which is part of the Michigan.gov website, users will be able to:

- post payments to a court's case management system;
- use the state's secure credit card processing application; and
- pay multiple tickets to different courts with one credit card transaction.

Because of changes in the operational environments for hosting and credit card processing, the e-ticket payment project only added the 38<sup>th</sup> District Court in Eastpointe in 2004. However, 10 additional sites will be added in 2005.

### **eFiling**

Lawyers and laypeople will be able to file court documents from their computers under another judicial branch technology project, known as eFiling. In 2004, two courts – Ottawa County Circuit Court and Eastpointe District Court – began offering eFiling on a limited basis.

In the Ottawa Circuit program, attorneys subscribe to an eFiling service. Documents submitted to the service are printed by the court clerk and then manually processed. Only attorney subscribers and designated court staff have access to the electronic file. In Wayne County, a private vendor provides electronic service of pleadings for the court's asbestos docket. This electronic service has eliminated paper copies of court documents and improved service for all asbestos docket participants.

To make it possible for all state courts to offer eFiling, in 2004 the Supreme Court began work on an Enterprise eFiling Manager (EFM). The EFM will interface with executive branch agencies and vendors that already provide electronic service of pleadings. In addition to

## FY 2006 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court

importing data from those sources, the EFM will interact and exchange information with all state courts' case and docket management systems.

In November 2004, the 38<sup>th</sup> District Court in Eastpointe became the first to use the EFM for general civil cases. In 2005, the Michigan Court of Appeals will implement the EFM for cases from the Michigan Public Service Commission. SCAO's JIS Division will evaluate these two pilot projects in 2005 to determine whether and how to expand eFiling. The web site address for the JIS eFiling service is <https://secure.courts.michigan.gov/courts/wps/portal>.

### **Collections at Michigan Trial Courts**

Improvement of the collection of court-ordered financial sanctions is a top priority for the Michigan judiciary. If these court-ordered financial sanctions are not collected, the offender may believe he or she has beaten the system. A commitment to improving court collections will maintain the credibility and integrity of the court while at the same time increasing revenue for the recipients of the funds. The Supreme Court has identified the enforcement of court orders for fines and other financial obligations as a top priority. Those who are sentenced to jail or prison terms are not allowed to decide whether to comply, and it can't be any different for orders to pay fines and other financial obligations.

Several steps have been taken by the Supreme Court in recent years to improve the collection process at the courts including:

- Supported statutory authorization of a 20% late penalty for a person who fails to pay fees or costs within 56 days after that amount is due and for the Department of Treasury to intercept state tax refunds and take other collection action to satisfy outstanding obligations.
- Published a manual that outlines guidelines for trial court collections, including best practice standards, discussion of best practices, guidelines for developing a collection plan, and sample forms and references. This manual can be found on the Supreme Court web site at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/standards/#collect>.
- Adopted Michigan Court Rule 1.110, which requires that fines, costs, and other financial obligations imposed by the court be paid at the time of assessment unless good cause is shown.
- Supported enactment of legislation as part of the FY 2004 budget development process which consolidated certain assessments and costs in order to simplify the assessment, collection, and distribution of monetary obligations imposed by the courts; increased selected fees and assessments to provide additional revenue for local and state judicial operations; and provided funding for monitoring collections, distribution of fund receipts, management assistance, and audit of trial court collections.
- Established the position of Trial Court Collections Project Manager to be responsible for implementing and coordinating strategies and approaches to ensure trial court compliance with collection and fiscal management requirements and standards.

## FY 2006 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court

- Convened a Collections Advisory Committee of judges and a court administrator to develop a statewide strategy for improving the collection of court-ordered financial sanctions.
- Convened a workgroup of court administrators to identify report elements necessary to provide improved collection management information to the trial courts and the SCAO.
- Developed programs and data collection worksheets for use with on-site collections reviews to evaluate and document a court's procedures to assess, collect, and enforce financial penalties and obligations.
- Developed and began implementation of software enhancements for district and circuit courts that notify defendants of their outstanding balances at predetermined intervals until payment is received.
- Worked with the Department of Corrections (DOC) to develop a process and a form to be used to collect funds available from prisoner accounts to be applied to outstanding fine and cost balances and to develop a program to match circuit court cases with non-restitution balances due to a DOC file of prisoners.
- Through contracts with public accounting firms, expanded the number of audits of trial court records to ensure that fines, costs and fees are properly assessed, collected and distributed.
- Began developing procedures for targeting courts with low collection rates in order to provide technical assistance to improve collection processes.
- Continued efforts to identify areas where further legislative action is needed to strengthen the enforcement of court orders and judgments.
- Continued training on best practices for trial court collections which is currently included at MJI seminars and in SCAO updates for new chief judges, judges, probation officers, and court administrators.

The Highland Park District Court (30<sup>th</sup> District) is an example of a court that has been used to pilot several of the procedures described above. They have also piloted the use of locator services using national data bases to locate defendants and an automated telephone message system to contact defendants with an outstanding balance due the court. Over \$509,000 in overdue court fines and costs has been collected in ten months as part of that court's efforts to improve its operations overall.

## FY 2006 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court

### Drug Treatment Courts

Drug treatment courts have helped nonviolent offenders stop using alcohol and drugs, improve parenting skills, obtain employment and lead productive lives. Drug treatment courts hold offenders accountable for their behavior with intense judicial supervision, graduated sanctions, ongoing random mandatory drug testing, judicially supervised treatment, and aftercare programs. Michigan currently has 64 drug treatment courts, including four tribal drug treatment courts. The 64 courts include 25 adult, 6 family dependency, 16 DUI, 13 juvenile and 4 tribal. Eight of these are in the planning phase.

Family dependency courts are a relatively new addition to the drug treatment court movement. These courts target select abuse and neglect cases where substance abuse of one or both parents is a primary factor in the neglect or abuse of their children. Judges, attorneys, child protection, the Department of Human Services, and treatment personnel work collaboratively towards the goal of providing safe, nurturing, and permanent homes for children while simultaneously providing parents the necessary support to become drug and alcohol free. Family dependency courts feature strong judicial involvement and coordinate participant access to many support agencies within the community to help parents regain control of their lives and enhance the possibility of family reunification within mandatory legal timeframes.

Funding for drug treatment courts for FY 2005 remained at the same level as FY 2004 as \$4.6 million was made available in the Judiciary's appropriation, which includes \$1.8 million of federal Byrne Memorial Formula Grant funds, \$1.7 million from the Justice System Fund, and \$846,700 of general fund. Funding from the Justice System Fund and the general fund is part of SCAO's Michigan Drug Court Grant Program (MDCGP). An additional \$1.8 million of Byrne funds have also been made available through the Office of Drug Control Policy (ODCP), providing \$6.4 million of funding. With this combined funding, 45 drug treatment court programs have so far been awarded grants totaling \$5.6 million for FY 2005, as shown on the table on the next two pages.

With the federal Byrne funding in the judicial appropriation, the Judiciary is working with the Department of Corrections and the Office of Drug Control Policy to use the program to assist in avoiding prison bed space growth for non-violent offenders. These funds are targeting nonviolent probation violators and other nonviolent felony offenders who, based on local sentencing practices, are otherwise bound for prison. The long run goal is to reduce drug use and recidivism among this population of offenders.

# FY 2006 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court

Court	SCAO Byrne Award	SCAO MDCGP Awards	ODCP Byrne Award	Total 2005 Awards
<b>Barry County</b> Barry County Trial - Adult Barry County Trial - Juvenile	\$110,000	\$60,000 \$60,000	\$77,555	\$170,000 \$137,555
<b>Bay County</b> 74 <sup>th</sup> District, Bay City - DUI		\$100,000		\$100,000
<b>Calhoun County</b> 37 <sup>th</sup> Circuit - Adult	\$170,000	\$50,000		\$220,000
<b>Eaton County</b> 56 <sup>th</sup> Circuit - DUI		\$30,500	\$48,447	\$78,947
<b>Emmet County</b> 57 <sup>th</sup> Circuit - Juvenile		\$12,000		\$12,000
<b>Genesee County</b> 7 <sup>th</sup> Circuit - Adult 7 <sup>th</sup> Circuit - Family Dependency 67 <sup>th</sup> District - DUI	\$210,000	\$25,000 \$85,000 \$14,000	\$24,365	\$235,000 \$85,000 \$38,365
<b>Grand Traverse County</b> 13 <sup>th</sup> Circuit - Juvenile 86 <sup>th</sup> District, Traverse City - DUI		\$18,500 \$40,000	\$39,244 \$62,500	\$57,744 \$102,500
<b>Ingham County</b> 55 <sup>th</sup> District - DUI		\$35,000	\$65,000	\$100,000
<b>Iron County</b> 41 <sup>st</sup> Circuit - DUI		\$40,500	\$52,822	\$93,322
<b>Isabella County</b> Isabella County Trial - Adult		\$50,000	\$65,000	\$115,000
<b>Jackson County</b> 4 <sup>th</sup> Circuit - Adult		\$50,000		\$50,000
<b>Kalamazoo County</b> 9 <sup>th</sup> Circuit - Adult	\$225,000			\$225,000
<b>Kent County</b> 61 <sup>st</sup> District, Grand Rapids - DUI		\$115,000	\$322,006	\$437,006
<b>Lapeer County</b> 40 <sup>th</sup> Circuit - Juvenile			\$73,500	\$73,500
<b>Livingston County</b> 44 <sup>th</sup> Circuit - Adult	\$135,000			\$135,000
<b>Macomb County</b> 16 <sup>th</sup> Circuit - Adult 16 <sup>th</sup> Circuit - Juvenile 37 <sup>th</sup> District, Warren - Adult	\$225,000	\$37,500 \$100,000	\$65,000 \$200,000	\$225,000 \$102,500 \$300,000
<b>Manistee County</b> 19 <sup>th</sup> Circuit - Juvenile			\$49,188	\$49,188
<b>Monroe County</b> 38 <sup>th</sup> Circuit - Juvenile		\$115,000		\$115,000
<b>Oakland County</b> 6 <sup>th</sup> Circuit - Adult 6 <sup>th</sup> Circuit - Juvenile 43 <sup>rd</sup> District, Ferndale - DUI 46 <sup>th</sup> District, Southfield - DUI 47 <sup>th</sup> District, Farmington Hills - DUI 51 <sup>st</sup> District, Waterford - DUI 52-1 District, Novi - DUI 52-2 District, Clarkston - DUI 52-4 District, Troy - DUI	\$165,000	\$62,000 \$115,000 \$20,000 \$20,000 \$40,000 \$50,000 \$52,000 \$12,000	\$155,971 \$12,915 \$49,526 \$37,332 \$74,391	\$227,000 \$270,971 \$32,915 \$69,526 \$40,000 \$37,332 \$124,391 \$52,000 \$12,000

## FY 2006 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court

Court	SCAO Byrne Award	SCAO MDCGP Awards	ODCP Byrne Award	Total 2005 Awards
<b>Ottawa County</b>				
20 <sup>th</sup> Circuit -- Adult		\$30,000	\$91,494	\$121,494
58 <sup>th</sup> District -- DUI		\$115,000		\$115,000
<b>Washtenaw County</b>				
15th District, Ann Arbor -- DUI		\$60,000		\$60,000
Washtenaw County Trial -- Juvenile		\$90,000		\$90,000
<b>Wayne County</b>				
3 <sup>rd</sup> Circuit - Adult	\$255,000	\$45,000		\$300,000
3 <sup>rd</sup> Circuit -- Juvenile		\$43,000	\$225,000	\$268,000
17 <sup>th</sup> District, Redford - Adult		\$57,000		\$57,000
19 <sup>th</sup> District, Dearborn -- Adult		\$45,000	\$65,506	\$110,506
22 <sup>nd</sup> District, Inkster -- Adult		\$25,000		\$25,000
23 <sup>rd</sup> District, Taylor -- Adult			\$80,000	\$80,000
28 <sup>th</sup> District, Southgate - Adult			\$90,000	\$90,000
36 <sup>th</sup> District, Detroit - Adult		\$45,000	\$70,000	\$115,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,495,000</b>	<b>\$1,964,000</b>	<b>\$2,096,762</b>	<b>\$5,555,762</b>

### Justices' and Judges' Salaries

Included in the Governor's recommended budget is a net increase of \$417,600 in justices' and judges' salaries to recognize various judgeship changes from 2001 and 2002 legislation, to provide funding for the conversion of two part-time probate judges to full-time in 2005 and to provide necessary funding for judges' defined contribution and social security payroll tax costs.

### Economic Adjustments

The Governor's recommended budget includes net general fund increases of \$2,606,800 (\$2,831,200 gross) for employee economics. The recommended budget also includes general fund increases of \$1,164,400 for building occupancy and \$41,800 for private rent.

FY 2006 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court

**Michigan Supreme Court Fiscal Year 2006 Budget Request**

	<b>ENACTED 2004-2005</b>	<b>JUDICIARY PROPOSED AND GOVERNOR'S REC. FY 2006</b>
<b>APPROPRIATION SUMMARY:</b>		
Full-time equated exempted positions 582.5		
GROSS APPROPRIATION	253,216,700	257,728,800
Total interdepartmental grants	4,633,500	2,563,500
ADJUSTED GROSS APPROPRIATION	248,583,200	255,165,300
Total federal revenues	4,015,600	3,933,900
Special revenue funds:		
Total local revenues	3,298,100	3,466,000
Total private revenues	842,500	842,500
Total other restricted revenues	82,333,700	86,935,000
State general fund/general purpose	158,093,300	159,987,900
<b>SUPREME COURT</b>		
Full-time equated exempted positions 285.0		
Supreme Court Administration, 117.0 FTE positions	10,704,000	11,355,900
Judicial Institute, 19.0 FTE positions	2,661,300	2,762,100
State Court Administrative Office, 79.0 FTE positions	10,149,100	10,530,100
Judicial Information Systems, 21.0 FTE positions	4,608,500	2,591,500
Direct Trial Court Automation Support, 33.0 FTE positions	3,298,100	3,466,000
Foster Care Review Board, 12.0 FTE positions	1,207,500	1,270,800
Community Dispute Resolution Program, 4.0 FTE positions	2,248,400	2,271,300
Drug Treatment Courts	4,635,000	4,735,000
Other Federal Grants	275,000	275,000
GROSS APPROPRIATION	39,786,900	39,257,700
Appropriated from:		
Interdepartmental grant revenues:		
IDG from department of community health	1,800,000	1,800,000
IDG from department of career development	95,000	40,000
IDG from state police—criminal justice improvement	2,015,000	
IDG from state police—Michigan justice training fund	300,000	300,000
Federal revenues:		
DOJ—victims assistance program	50,000	50,000
DOJ—drug court training and evaluation	300,000	300,000
DOT—national highway safety traffic administration	215,300	100,000
HHS—access and visitation grant	387,000	387,000
HHS—children's justice grant	1,160,000	1,160,000
HHS—court improvement project	200,000	206,300
HHS—title IV-D child support program	907,700	907,700
HHS—title IV-E foster care program	520,600	547,900
Other federal grants	275,000	275,000

**FY 2006 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court**

	<b>ENACTED 2004-2005</b>	<b>JUDICIARY PROPOSED AND GOVERNOR'S REC. FY 2006</b>
<b>SUPREME COURT (continued)</b>		
Special revenue funds:		
Local—user fees	3,298,100	3,466,000
Private	169,000	169,000
Private—interest on lawyers trust accounts	232,700	232,700
Private—state justice institute	370,800	370,800
Community dispute resolution fees	2,248,400	2,271,300
Law exam fees	482,100	482,100
Drug court fund	1,688,300	1,920,500
Miscellaneous revenue	227,900	227,900
Justice system fund	600,000	700,000
State court fund	319,000	339,000
State general fund/general purpose	21,925,000	23,004,500
<b>COURT OF APPEALS</b>		
Full-time equated exempted positions 228.5 Operations, 228.5 FTE positions	17,911,800	19,047,700
<b>GROSS APPROPRIATION</b>	17,911,800	19,047,700
Appropriated from:		
Special revenue funds:		
Court filing/motion fees	1,746,000	1,721,000
Miscellaneous revenue	77,800	77,800
State general fund/general purpose	16,088,000	17,248,900
<b>BRANCHWIDE APPROPRIATIONS</b>		
Full-time equated exempted positions 4.0 Branchwide appropriations, 4.0 FTE positions	7,077,900	8,051,900
<b>GROSS APPROPRIATION</b>	7,077,900	8,051,900
Appropriated from:		
State general fund/general purpose	7,077,900	8,051,900



**FY 2006 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court**

	<b>ENACTED 2004-2005</b>	<b>JUDICIARY PROPOSED AND GOVERNOR'S REC. FY 2006</b>
<b>JUSTICES' AND JUDGES' COMPENSATION</b>		
Full-time judges' positions 613.0		
Supreme court justices' salaries, 7.0 judges	1,152,300	1,152,300
Court of appeals judges' salaries, 28.0 judges	4,240,300	4,240,300
District court judges' state base salaries, 258.0 judges	23,877,200	23,877,200
District court judicial salary standardization	11,796,800	11,796,800
Probate court judges' state base salaries, 103.0 judges	9,030,800	9,108,600
Probate court judicial salary standardization	4,344,200	4,389,800
Circuit court judges' state base salaries, 217.0 judges	20,416,900	20,440,400
Circuit court judicial salary standardization	9,910,700	9,922,100
Judges' retirement system defined contributions	2,704,100	2,919,200
OASI, social security	4,689,700	4,733,900
<b>GROSS APPROPRIATION</b>	<b>92,163,000</b>	<b>92,580,600</b>
Appropriated from:		
Special revenue funds:		
Court fee fund	7,090,200	7,090,200
State general fund/general purpose	85,072,800	85,490,400
<b>JUDICIAL AGENCIES</b>		
Full-time equated exempted positions 10.0		
Judicial tenure commission, 10.0 FTE positions	989,000	1,072,900
<b>GROSS APPROPRIATION</b>	<b>989,000</b>	<b>1,072,900</b>
Appropriated from:		
State general fund/general purpose	989,000	1,072,900
<b>INDIGENT DEFENSE—CRIMINAL</b>		
Full-time equated exempted positions 55.0		
Appellate public defender program, 47.0 FTE positions	4,586,500	4,872,900
Appellate assigned counsel administration, 8.0 FTE positions	843,500	887,000
<b>GROSS APPROPRIATION</b>	<b>5,430,000</b>	<b>5,759,900</b>
Appropriated from:		
Interdepartmental grant revenues:		
IDG from state police—Michigan justice training fund	423,500	423,500
Special revenue funds:		
Private—interest on lawyers trust accounts	70,000	70,000
Miscellaneous revenue	113,100	113,100
State general fund/general purpose	4,823,400	5,153,300
<b>INDIGENT LEGAL ASSISTANCE—CIVIL</b>		
Indigent legal civil assistance	7,337,000	7,937,000
<b>GROSS APPROPRIATION</b>	<b>7,337,000</b>	<b>7,937,000</b>
Appropriated from:		
Special revenue funds:		
State court fund	7,337,000	7,937,000
State general fund/general purpose	0	0

**FY 2006 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court**

	<b>ENACTED 2004-2005</b>	<b>JUDICIARY PROPOSED AND GOVERNOR'S REC. FY 2006</b>
<b>TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS</b>		
Court equity fund reimbursements	68,906,000	70,406,000
Judicial technology improvement fund	4,465,000	4,465,000
<b>GROSS APPROPRIATION</b>	<b>73,371,000</b>	<b>74,871,000</b>
Appropriated from:		
Special revenue funds:		
Court equity fund	46,788,800	50,440,000
Judicial technology improvement fund	4,465,000	4,465,000
State general fund/general purpose	22,117,200	19,966,000
<b>GRANTS AND REIMBURSEMENTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT</b>		
Drunk driving case-flow program	2,300,000	2,300,000
Drug case-flow program	250,000	250,000
Juror compensation reimbursement	6,600,000	6,600,000
Transcript fee reimbursement	100	100
<b>GROSS APPROPRIATION</b>	<b>9,150,100</b>	<b>9,150,100</b>
Appropriated from:		
Special revenue funds:		
Drunk driving fund	2,300,000	2,300,000
Drug fund	250,000	250,000
Juror compensation fund	6,600,000	6,600,000
Transcript fee fund	100	100
State general fund/general purpose	0	0